UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA CHARLESTON DIVISION

Get Joe's LLC, Christopher Rice, and) Richard Ridgeway,	Civil Action No.: 4:14-2626-BHH
Plaintiff,) vs.	OPINION AND ORDER
Hangover Joe's Holding Corporation,) Hangover Joe's Inc., Hangover Joe's) Products, LLC, Michael Alan Jaynes,) Brian Daniels, and Shawn Adamson,)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation ("Report") (ECF No. 37) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, recommending that the plaintiff's motion to remand (ECF No. 7) be denied, the defendant's motion to compel arbitration and dismiss (ECF No. 4) be granted, and this case be dismissed.

Because the plaintiffs are *pro se*, this case was automatically referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e). Objections to the Report were due by January 30, 2015, and no objections have been filed by any party.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is

Date Filed 02/04/15 4:14-cv-02626-BHH Entry Number 40 Page 2 of 2

The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the

recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the

Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of a

timely filed Objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but

instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the

record in order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc.

Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report of

the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court

ACCEPTS and incorporates the Report, (ECF No. 37), by reference into this

Order. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the plaintiff's motion to remand (ECF No. 7)

is DENIED, the defendant's motion to compel arbitration and dismiss (ECF No. 4)

is GRANTED, and this case is dismissed. All other pending motions are denied

as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks United States District Judge

February 4, 2015

Greenville, South Carolina

2